UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,186	06/26/2003	Cezary Marcjan	MS1-4122US	7627

22801   7590   11/27/2009
LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE
SUITE 1400
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
MURRAY, DANIEL C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2443	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/27/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/609,186	MARCJAN, CEZARY
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DANIEL C. MURRAY	2443	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 July 2009*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1,3-10,12-15,17-19,21 and 22* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1,3-10,12-15,17-19,21 and 22* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 02JUL2009. **Claims 1, 3-10,**

12-15, 17-19, 21, and 22 are now pending in the present application. **This Action is made FINAL.**

2.   **Claims 2 and 11** have been canceled by Applicant.

Specification

3.   The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed

subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is

required:

> ➢ **Claims 10 and 19:** the claim terminology "computer readable storage media" lacks proper
>
> antecedent basis.

For the purposes of examination "computer readable storage media" will be interpreted as

memory as disclosed in Applicant's specification (paragraph [0078]). Appropriate correction is

required.

Claim Objections

4.   **Claim 10** is objected to because of the following informalities:

> ➢ **Claim 10,** line 25; deleted the redundant "." after "threshold".
>
> ➢ **Claim 10,** line 8; replace "the" with --a-- before "user" in order to provide proper
>
> antecedent basis for "user"

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section
> 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the
> subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

6.   The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966),

that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or
        nonobviousness.

7.   **Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12, and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kenyon et al. (US Patent # US 6,792,430 B1) in view of **Batty et al. (US Patent # US 6,223,212**

B1).

        a) Consider **claims 1,** Kenyon et al. clearly show and disclose, a method of sharing computer

objects (abstract, column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49, lines 54-67, column 2 line 1, column 4 lines 3-8,

column 5 lines 26-29), comprising: storing in computer memory, association information relating to

one or more associations (column 4 lines 3-8, column 7 lines 10-15) between a selected object in a

first computer space and one or more first objects in the first computer space, wherein the

association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between a user

and the objects in the first computer space (abstract, column 2 lines 14-24, column 3 lines 31-40,

column 4 lines 11-23 lines 28-36, column 5 lines 26-30, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 16-24),

and wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts or communications (digital

information objects, documents, files)(abstract, column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49 lines 66-67, column 2

line 1, column 4 lines 3-6, column 8 lines 32-36); sharing the selected object (documents, emails,

shared network files)(column 8 lines 32-36) and the association information from the first computer

space with a second computer space, the second computer space including one or more of the

second objects that match the one or more first objects (column 1 lines 62-65, column 3 lines 34-40,

column 7 lines 10-15); identifying in the second computer space the one or more second objects in

the second computer space (column 1 lines 62-65, column 3 lines 34-40, column 5 lines 14-29,

column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 10-15); automatically forming the one or more associations

(inherent from the teachings of Kenyon et al. since keywords defining overlays (i.e. associations) are

contained in the document and they are transferred with the document when shared and the overlay

is downloadable and can be made available globally)(column 5 lines 14-29, column 6 lines 59-66,

column 7 lines 10-15) between the selected object and the second objects preexisting in the second

computer space upon the sharing of the selected object and the association information from the

first computer space to the second computer space (column 3 lines 34-40, column 5 lines 14-29,

column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 10-15); and storing in the first computer space association

information relating to an association between the selected object and the second computer space

(column 4 lines 3-8, column 7 lines 10-15). However, Kenyon et al. does not specifically disclose

determining whether the association between the selected object and the second computer space is

of an extent greater than a predetermined threshold; wherein the selected object is shared from the

first computer space with the second computer space upon a determination that the association

between the selected object and the second computer space is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold.

Batty et al. shows and discloses a computer method and system for sharing an application program and, more specifically, to a method and system for sharing an application program with multiple computer systems, wherein Batty et al. discloses determining whether the association between the selected object and the second computer space is of an extent greater than a predetermined threshold (figure 2, column 2 lines 45-56, column 4 lines 8-34); wherein the selected object is shared from the first computer space with the second computer space upon a determination that the association between the selected object and the second computer space is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold (column 2 lines 56-61, column 4 lines 8-34).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Batty et al. and Kenyon et al. since both concern sharing information about digital information objects between users and as such, both are with in the same environment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the time the invention was made to incorporate sharing a selected object from a first computer space to a second computer space based on the strength of the association of the selected object with the second computer space, as taught by, Batty et al. into the system of Kenyon et al. for the purpose of coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems (Batty; column 2 lines 42-44), thereby allowing a user access/to share to the same information as another user.

b) Consider **claim 10,** Kenyon et al. clearly show and disclose, computer readable storage media that facilitate forming context associations between first and second objects that are stored in computer memory and are associated with each other based on user computer interactions (abstract,

column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49, lines 54-67, column 2 line 1, column 4 lines 3-8, column 5 lines 26-29), the computer readable storage media comprising: instructions for storing in memory association information relating to one or more associations (column 4 lines 3-8, column 7 lines 10-15) between a selected object in a first computer space and one or more first objects in the first computer space, wherein the association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between the user and the objects in the first computer space (abstract, column 2 lines 14-24, column 3 lines 31-40, column 4 lines 11-23 lines 28-36, column 5 lines 26-30, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 16-24); instructions for sharing the selected object (documents, emails, shared network files)(column 8 lines 32-36) and the stored association information from the first computer space with a second computer space, the second computer space including one or more second objects that are respectively identical to one or more of the first objects (column 1 lines 62-65, column 3 lines 34-40, column 7 lines 10-15); instructions for identifying in the second computer space the one or more second objects (column 1 lines 62-65, column 3 lines 34-40, column 5 lines 14-29, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 10-15); instructions for automatically creating one or more associations between the selected object and the one or more second objects in the second computer space (inherent from the teachings of Kenyon et al. since keywords defining overlays (i.e. associations) are contained in the document and they are transferred with the document when shared and the overlay is downloadable and can be made available globally)(column 3 lines 34-40, column 5 lines 14-29, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 10-15); and instructions for storing in the first computer space association information relating to an association between the selected object and the second computer space (column 4 lines 3-8, column 7 lines 10-15). However, Kenyon et al. does not specifically disclose determining whether the association between the selected object and the second computer space is of an extent greater than a predetermined threshold; wherein the selected object is

shared from the first computer space with the second computer space upon a determination that the association between the selected object and the second computer space is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold.

Batty et al. shows and discloses a computer method and system for sharing an application program and, more specifically, to a method and system for sharing an application program with multiple computer systems, wherein Batty et al. discloses instructions for determining whether the association between the selected object and the second computer space is of an extent greater than a predetermined threshold (figure 2, column 2 lines 45-56, column 4 lines 8-34); wherein the selected object is shared from the first computer space with the second computer space upon a determination that the association between the selected object and the second computer space is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold (column 2 lines 56-61, column 4 lines 8-34).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Batty et al. and Kenyon et al. since both concern sharing information about digital information objects between users and as such, both are with in the same environment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the time the invention was made to incorporate sharing a selected object from a first computer space to a second computer space based on the strength of the association of the selected object with the second computer space, as taught by, Batty et al. into the system of Kenyon et al. for the purpose of coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems (Batty; column 2 lines 42-44), thereby allowing a user access/to share to the same information as another user.

c) Consider **claim 3 and 12,** and **as applied to claim 1 and 10 above,** Kenyon et al. as modified by Batty et al. clearly show and disclose the method and medium of claims 1 and 10 in which the one or more associations between the selected object in the first computer space and the one or more first objects in the first computer space include an indirect association between the selected object and a particular first object, the indirect association including a direct association between the selected object and an intervening first object and a direct association between the intervening first object and the particular first object (inherent from the teachings of Kenyon et al. since overlays are created which include concepts described by keywords and linked to objects which may in turn be linked to other concepts through similar association, thus it is possible for objects to be linked bother directly and indirectly through their associations)(Kenyon; abstract, column 1 lines 46-49 lines 62-65, column 2 lines 52-54 lines 60-67, column 3 lines 1-10 lines 21-24, column 7 lines 4-24).

d) Consider **claims 5 and 14,** and **as applied to claims 1 and 10 above,** Kenyon et al. show and disclose the method and medium of claim 1 and 10 in which at least one of the one or more associations is unidirectional between the selected object the one of the first objects (Batty et al., figure 1, column 3 lines 66-67, column 4 lines 1-3 lines 33-40, column 5 lines 21-23).

e) Consider **claim 6,** and **as applied to claim 1 above,** Kenyon et al. as modified by Batty et al. clearly show and disclose the method of claim 1 in which the selected object and the first objects include computer files (digital information objects, documents, files)(Kenyon; abstract, column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49 lines 66-67, column 2 line 1, column 4 lines 3-6, column 8 lines 32-36).

f) Consider **claim 7,** and **as applied to claim 1 above,** Kenyon et al. as modified by Batty et al. clearly show and disclose the method of claim 1 in which at least one of the first and second

computer spaces corresponds to a computer memory store (inherent from the teachings if Kenyon et al. since a memory would be required to store WWW sites, emails, local documents, shared network files, presentation program files, spread sheets etc.)(Kenyon; column 8 lines 32-41).

g) Consider **claim 8,** and **as applied to claim 1 above,** Kenyon et al. as modified by Batty et al. clearly show and disclose the method of claim 1 in which at least one of the first and second computer spaces corresponds to an accessible space of computer objects (Kenyon; abstract, column 1 lines 46-65, column 2 lines 52-54, column 8 lines 32-36) that are accessible by a user.

h) Consider **claim 9,** and **as applied to claim 1 above,** Kenyon et al. as modified by Batty et al. clearly shows and disclose the method of claim 1 in which the sharing includes copying the selected object from the first computer space to the second computer space (Kenyon; column 7 lines 10-15, column 8 lines 32-41).

8.   **Claims 4 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kenyon et al. (US Patent # US 6,792,430 B1)** in view of **Batty et al. (US Patent # US 6,223,212, B1)** as applied to **claims 3 and 12** above, and further in view of **Hatori (US Patent Publication # US 2003/00221122 A1).**

a) Consider **claims 4 and 13**, and as applied to **claims 3 and 12 above,** Kenyon et al. as modified by Batty et al. clearly shows and discloses the claimed invention except automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space the intervening first object, together with the direct association between the selected object and the intervening first object and the direct association between the intervening first object and the particular first object.

In the same field of endeavor, Hatori clearly shows and discloses a file sharing service

(abstract, paragraph [0004], [0005], [0010]) that allows downloading files (paragraph [0053]

paragraph [0054]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hatori into the teachings of Kenyon et al. as

modified by Batty et al. for the purpose of sharing the intervening object together with the direct

association between the first object and the particular object. Such a feature would have made the

system of Kenyon et al. more efficient by not only sharing the indirect association between the first

object and particular object but also sharing the intervening object and the direct associations

between the first object and particular object that cause the indirect association to be made.

9.   **Claims 15, 17, 19 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kenyon et al. (US Patent # US 6,792,430 B1) in view of **Hatori (US Patent Publication # US

2003/00221122 A1).**

        a) Consider **claim 15,** Kenyon et al. clearly show and disclose, a method of sharing

computer objects comprising: storing in a computer memory, association information relating to one

or more associations (column 4 lines 3-8, column 7 lines 10-15) between a selected object in a first

computer space and a second computer space, wherein the association information is determined

automatically based upon prior interactions between a user and one or more objects in the first

computer space (abstract, column 2 lines 14-24, column 3 lines 31-40, column 4 lines 11-23 lines 28-

36, column 5 lines 26-30, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 16-24), and wherein the objects are at

least one of files, applications, contacts or communications (digital information objects, documents,

files)(abstract, column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49 lines 66-67, column 2 line 1, column 4 lines 3-6,

column 8 lines 32-36); initiating sharing of the selected object (documents, emails, shared network

files)(column 8 lines 32-36) from the first computer space with the second computer space.

However, Kenyon et al. does not specifically disclose determining an extent of the association of the

selected object with the second computer space; permitting sharing of the selected object with the

second computer space if it is determined that the extend of association of the selected object with

the second computer space is greater than a predetermined threshold; and interfering with the

sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected

object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold.

Hatori shows and discloses file sharing service in which the sharing of files is

terminated/disabled bases upon a predetermined security level (i.e. threshold) wherein, the service

determines an extent of the association of the selected object with the second computer space

(abstract, paragraph [0010] lines 1-7 lines 13-17, paragraph [0012], paragraph [0013], paragraph

[0015], paragraph [0016], paragraph [0021]); permits sharing of the selected object with the second

computer space if it is determined that the association of the selected object with the second

computer space is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold (abstract, paragraph [0010]

lines 1-7 lines 13-17, paragraph [0013], paragraph [0015], paragraph [0016], paragraph [0021]); and

interferes with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association

of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the

predetermined threshold (abstract, paragraph [0010] lines 1-7 lines 13-17, paragraph [0012],

paragraph [0013], paragraph [0015], paragraph [0016], paragraph [0021]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hatori into the system of Kenyon et al. for the

purpose of permitting/interfering with the sharing of a selected object based on a predetermined

threshold for security reasons (paragraph [0021]). Such a feature would have made the overall system

of Kenyon et al. more secure by limiting access based on a predetermined threshold.

b) Consider **claim 17,** and **as applied to claim 15 above,** Kenyon et al. as modified by

Hatori clearly show and disclose, the method of claim 15 further including automatically sharing

from the first computer space with the second computer space an association (inherent from the

teachings of Kenyon et al. since keywords defining overlays (i.e. associations) are contained in the

document and they are transferred with the document when shared and the overlay is downloadable

and can be made available globally)(Kenyon; column 5 lines 14-29, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7

lines 10-15) in the first computer space between the selected object and a first object that is in both

the first computer space and the second computer space.

c) Consider **claim 19,** Kenyon et al. clearly show and disclose, computer readable storage

media that facilitate forming context associations between first and second objects that are stored in

computer memory and are associated with each other based on user computer interactions (abstract,

column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49, lines 54-67, column 2 line 1, column 4 lines 3-8, column 5 lines 26-

29), the computer readable media, comprising: instructions for storing in memory association

information relating to one or more associations (column 4 lines 3-8, column 7 lines 10-15) between

a selected object in a first computer space and a second computer space, wherein the association

information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between the user and the

objects (abstract, column 2 lines 14-24, column 3 lines 31-40, column 4 lines 11-23 lines 28-36,

column 5 lines 26-30, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 16-24), and wherein the objects are at

least one of files, applications, contacts and communications (digital information objects,

documents, files)(abstract, column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49 lines 66-67, column 2 line 1, column 4 lines

3-6, column 8 lines 32-36). However, Kenyon et al does not specifically discloses instructions for

determining whether the association of the selected object with the second computer space is of an

extent greater than a predetermined threshold; instructions for permitting sharing of the selected

object with the second computer space if it is determined that the association of the selected object

with the second computer space is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold; and

instructions for interfering with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if

the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater

than the predetermined threshold.

Hatori shows and discloses file sharing service in which the sharing of files is

terminated/disabled bases upon a predetermined security level (i.e. threshold) wherein, the service

determines whether the association of the selected object with the second computer space is of an

extent greater than a predetermined threshold (abstract, paragraph [0010] lines 1-7 lines 13-17,

paragraph [0012], paragraph [0013], paragraph [0015], paragraph [0016], paragraph [0021]); permits

sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if it is determined that the association

of the selected object with the second computer space is of an extent greater than the predetermined

threshold (abstract, paragraph [0010] lines 1-7 lines 13-17, paragraph [0013], paragraph [0015],

paragraph [0016], paragraph [0021]); and interferes with the sharing of the selected object with the

second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is

not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold (abstract, paragraph [0010] lines 1-7 lines

13-17, paragraph [0012], paragraph [0013], paragraph [0015], paragraph [0016], paragraph [0021]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hatori into the system of Kenyon et al. for the

purpose of permitting/interfering with the sharing of a selected object based on a predetermined

threshold for security reasons (paragraph [0021]). Such a feature would have made the overall system

of Kenyon et al. more secure by limiting access based on a predetermined threshold.

d) Consider **claim 21,** and **as applied to claim 19 above,** Kenyon et al. as modified by

Hatori clearly show and disclose, the medium of claim 19 further including instructions for

automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space an association

(inherent from the teachings of Kenyon et al. since keywords defining overlays (i.e. associations) are

contained in the document and they are transferred with the document when shared and the overlay

is downloadable and can be made available globally)(Kenyon; column 5 lines 14-29, column 6 lines

59-66, column 7 lines 10-15) in the first computer space between the selected object and a first

object that is in both the first computer space and the second computer space.

10.   **Claim 18** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kenyon et al. (US**

Patent # US 6,792,430 B1) in view of **Hatori (US Patent Publication # US 2003/00221122 A1)**

and further in view of **Batty et al. (US Patent # US 6,223,212, B1).**

a) Consider **claim 18,** and **as applied to claim 17 above,** Kenyon et al. as modified by

Hatori. However, Kenyon et al. as modified by Hatori does not specifically disclose that the

association is unidirectional between the selected object the first object.

Batty et al. show and disclose that one or more associations are unidirectional (figure 1,

column 3 lines 66-67, column 4 lines 1-3 lines 33-40, column 5 lines 21-23) between the selected

object the one of the first objects.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Batty et al. into the system of Kenyon et al. as

modified by Hatori for the purpose of determining control over an application (column 4 lines 33-40).

11.   **Claim 22** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kenyon et al. (US Patent # US 6,792,430 B1)** in view of **Hatori (US Patent Publication # US 2003/00221122 A1)** and further in view of **Farnham et al. (US Patent # US 7,343,365 B2).**

a) Consider **claim 22,** and **as applied to claim 15 above,** Kenyon et al. as modified by Hatori et al. clearly show and disclose, the method of claim 15, determining the extent of association between the selected object and the second computer space (abstract, paragraph [0010] lines 1-7 lines 13-17, paragraph [0013], paragraph [0015], paragraph [0016], paragraph [0021]). However, Kenyon et al. as modified by Hatori et al. does not specifically disclose the extent of association between the selected object and the second computer space is determined based on at least on an extent of association between the selected object and a user associated with the second computer space.

Farnham et al. show and disclose an automatic context association system that identifies associations between computer objects and accesses them based in accordance with user context, wherein extent of association is determined based on at least on an extent of association between the selected object and a user associated with the second computer space (abstract, column 2 lines 1-4, column 3 lines 32-45 lines 54-58 lines 66-67, column 4 lines 1-10 lines 51-67, column 5 lines 36-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the time the invention was made to incorporate determining an extent of association between the selected object and a user, as taught by, Farnham et al. into the system of Kenyon et al. as modified by Hatori et al.

for the purpose of determining access to objects based on the extent of a user's association with the

object (Farnham; column 3 lines 32-39).

Response to Arguments

12.   Applicant's arguments filed 02JUL2009 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant argues Kenyon fails to teach or suggest that "association information is

determined automatically based upon prior interactions between a user and the objects"

and "sharing the selected object and the association information. Instead, Kenyon

uses "keywords" and links to other objects."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees; Kenyon clearly discloses association information is

determined automatically based upon prior interactions between a user and the objects (abstract,

column 2 lines 14-24, column 3 lines 31-40, column 4 lines 11-23 lines 28-36, column 5 lines 26-30,

column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 16-24) and sharing the selected object (documents, emails,

shared network files)(column 8 lines 32-36) and the association information (overlay)(column 1 lines

62-65, column 3 lines 34-40, column 7 lines 10-15). Kenyon clearly discloses linking together

(associating) digital information objects (selected object, objects) of a digital information space

(computer space) includes creating an overlay (association information). The overlay includes at least

one concept node, each concept node expressing one concept. When a digital information object in

the digital information space is accessed (interaction between the user and the objects) the digital

information object is examined to determine if at least one concept in common with concepts

expressed in concept nodes is included. If the digital information object and the overlay include at

least one common concept, the digital information object is automatically and dynamically linked

(associated) to each concept node expressing common concepts. A user may create an information

node in the overlay representing the digital information object. Furthermore, Kenyon clearly

discloses when a second digital information object is accessed (interaction between user and

objects). A check is made to determine if the second digital information object includes at least one

concept in common with concepts expressed in the concept nodes. The first information object and

the second information object are automatically and dynamically linked (associated) if the

information node representing the first digital information object is linked to at least one concept

node expressing a concept included in the second digital information object. This allows the user

accessing the second information object to directly access the first information object (association

information based on prior interactions between a user and the objects). Kenyon clearly discloses

that associations between objects are formed based on a user's interaction with those objects.

Therefore, Kenyon clearly discloses association information is determined automatically based upon

prior interactions between a user and the objects

Kenyon clearly discloses sharing the selected object (digital information objects, documents,

emails, files, shared network files)(abstract, column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49 lines 66-67, column 2 line

1, column 4 lines 3-6, column 8 lines 32-36) and the association information (overlay)(column 1 lines

62-65, column 3 lines 34-40, column 7 lines 10-15). Kenyon clearly discloses the selected objects are

digital information objects, documents, emails, files, shared network files, and the like and it is

notoriously well known in the art that these objects are shared between computer spaces. Kenyon

also discloses keywords defining overlays (association information) are contained in the document

and they are transferred with the document when shared, therefore it is clear that the association

information is also transferred. Furthermore, Kenyon clearly discloses that the overlay (association

information) is downloadable, can be shared with other users, and can be made available globally.

Therefore, Kenyon clearly discloses sharing the selected object and the association information.

Applicant has also pointed out that Kenyon uses "keywords" and links to other objects

while arguing that Kenyon fails to teach association between objects. It is unclear to the Examiner

how Kenyon can both simultaneously teach linking objects based on keywords (as indicated by

Applicant) and concepts and yet fail to teach the association of objects when it is clear that a link is

an association. Furthermore, regardless of whether Kenyon uses keywords, links, and/or concepts,

an association is still clearly formed between objects and Kenyon, therefore teaches the claimed

feature.

Applicant argues Batty does not teach or suggest a "predetermined threshold" and

that "the selected object is shared" if the association "is of an extent greater than the

predetermined threshold, …"

The Examiner respectfully disagrees; Batty clearly teaches a "predetermined threshold"

(figure 2, column 2 lines 45-56, column 4 lines 8-34) and that "the selected object is shared" if the

association "is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold (column 2 lines 56-61, column

4 lines 8-34). Batty clearly discloses a predetermined threshold. Batty clearly discloses using a share

identifier (predetermined threshold) and a control identifier to coordinate the exchange of data

(sharing of objects) and the control of the application. Batty clearly discloses that the selected object

is shared if the association is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold.

Batty clearly discloses a predetermined threshold. Batty clearly discloses a technique that

allows the computer systems (computer space) that are sharing the application (object) to exchange

capabilities (association information) so that each computer system (computer space) can display an

accurate representation of the output of the shared application (object). Each computer system

(computer space) broadcasts to each other computer system (computer space) the capabilities that it supports. Once a computer system receives the capabilities of all the other computer systems, it calculates a set of shared capabilities (association information). Since each computer system (computer space) uses the same predefined algorithm to determine the shared capabilities (association information), the calculated set (predetermined threshold) is the same for each computer system (computer space). When a computer system (computer space) joins in or leaves the sharing of the application, each computer system (computer space) again recalculates the capabilities including or omitting the capabilities of the joining or leaving application. Thus, each computer system can calculate the shared capabilities (association information/predetermined threshold) without the need for a complex communications scheme.

Batty clearly discloses that the selected object is shared if the association is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold. Batty clearly discloses using a share identifier (predetermined threshold) and a control identifier to coordinate the exchange of data (sharing of objects) and the control of the application. As computer systems (computer spaces) join in and leave the sharing of an application (object), the share identifier (predetermined threshold) is updated by each computer system. Thus, each computer system maintains a local version of the share identifier (predetermined threshold). When data is exchanged (objects are shared), the share identifier (predetermined threshold) is included with the data. Thus, when a computer system (computer space) receives data with a share identifier (predetermined threshold) that does not match the current share identifier (predetermined threshold), it disregards the data (i.e. shares data only if the threshold is exceeded). In this way, the computer system (computer space) can ensure that data generated based on the capabilities (association information) of computer systems (computer spaces) that have already left the share are disregarded.

Batty clearly creates association using by establishing set of capabilities (associations) between shared applications which are then used to determine a share identifier (predetermined threshold). If the share identifier does not meet the current share identifier (i.e. the predetermined threshold is not exceeded) the data/application (object) is not shared. Therefore, Batty clearly discloses a predetermined threshold and that the selected object is shared if the association is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold.

Applicant argues Kenyon fails to teach or suggest "the objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts or communications"

The Examiner respectfully disagrees; Kenyon clearly discloses that the objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts or communications (abstract, column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49 lines 66-67, column 2 line 1, column 4 lines 3-6, column 8 lines 32-36). Kenyon clearly discloses the sharing of objects to include digital information objects, documents, files, emails (communications), and shared network files.

Applicant argues Hatori does not teach or suggest that "association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between a user and one or more objects in the first computer space, and wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts or communications."

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Hatori was not cited by the Examiner as teaching the aforementioned features. Kenyon, however, was. Applicant is directed to the response to arguments above for detailed arguments regarding these claimed features.

Conclusion

13.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS

from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the

mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the

THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on

the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory

period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

> US 2009/0182778 A1
> US 2009/0276399 A1
> US 2009/0193099 A1
> US 7,610,562 B2
> US 7,587,501 B2

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to DANIEL C. MURRAY whose telephone number is 571-270-1773. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 0800-1700 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Tonia Dollinger can be reached on (571)-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DCM/
Examiner, Art Unit 2443

/J Bret Dennison/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443